

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



February 24, 1989

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE NO. I-15-89

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: COUNTY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT FUNDING AND STAFFING
LEVELS REPORT

Enclosed is a copy of the County Services Block Grant Funding and Staffing Levels Report which was recently submitted by the State Department of Social Services to the Legislature in compliance with the requirement set forth in Budget Item 5180-001-001 Provision 8 of the Supplemental Report of the Budget Act of 1987.

This report identifies funding and staffing levels for the program costs funded in the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) and discusses the adequacy of the CSBG funding.

Any questions regarding this report should be addressed to Lynda Grimm, Supervisor, the Adult Services Bureau at (916) 323-5760.

Original Signed By:
Loren D. Suter

LOREN D. SUTER
Deputy Director
Adult and Family Services

Enclosure

cc: CWDA

bcc: L. Suter 17-18
R. Barton 6-536
L. Grimm 6-536
K. Erickson 6-536
ASB Chron
✓ ASB Files
✓ Record Services 14-80

KE/ag/afkmath/acin

Report To The Legislature

County Services Block Grant Funding

and

Staffing Levels

Supplemental Report

1987 Budget Act

5180-001-001, Provision 8

October 1988



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
George Deukmejian, Governor
HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY
Clifford L. Allenby, Secretary
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
Linda S. McMahon, Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Methodology | 3 |
| Part I. County Compliance with the In-Home Supportive Services Regulations | 5 |
| Part II. Number of Cases Carried by In-Home Supportive Services Social Workers..... | 6 |
| Part III. Statewide Summary of the Services Provided by the Counties: | |
| A. Information and Referral Program..... | 8 |
| B. Adult Protective Services Program..... | 8 |
| C. Optional Services Programs..... | 10 |
| D. Staff Development Program..... | 11 |
| Part IV. Amount of County Overmatch for the County Services Block Grant | 12 |
| Part V. Extent to Which Purchasing Power Losses Have Affected Delivery of Service | 14 |
| Summary of Conclusions | 17 |

Attachment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report identifies funding and staffing levels for the program costs funded in the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) and identifies the resources that will be available from CSBG to fund any future program requirements resulting from the current Adult Protective Services (APS) pilot projects. The lack of Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increases to the CSBG, together with the rising need for services at the local level have hampered the Counties' ability to respond to the needs of abused and neglected adults. One reason for the rise in service need is the growth of the population over 65 years of age. It has grown 24.5 percent from 1980 to 1987 while the statewide population has only grown 15.3 percent.

Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 81/82, the Budget Act limited the State's participation in COLA increases to the Other County Social Services (OCSS) Programs. If a County granted COLA increases in excess of the State limits, the County was solely responsible for the costs. The compounding effects of the lack of COLA increases have significantly reduced the Counties' ability to meet program objectives. A few Counties which met certain criteria were permitted to transfer Child Welfare Services (CWS) funds to cover adult services costs. In FY 86/87, five counties transferred funds from CWS to CSBG totaling \$2,226,214. Other Counties which would have made such transfers were precluded from doing so because of inadequacies in their CWS programs.

The amount of the Counties' overmatch has been continually on the rise. For FY 86/87, the total amount of County overmatch for CSBG funding was \$18,458,358.

Caseloads have been continuing to rise but with limited resources, only those individuals facing the most serious crisis situations are likely to be served.

For FY 86/87, the total State/Federal/County expenditure for just the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) administration of the CSBG cost was \$60,825,110 while the State/Federal funding allocated for all CSBG programs was only \$61,537,052. Because of block grant funding, the extent to which state funds are spent on each individual CSBG funded program as opposed to expenditures of County funds on each program is not readily available. Although it is not likely, it would be possible for Counties to use State/Federal funds to first meet the specifically mandated costs of IHSS activities. If Counties did this, only \$711,942 in State/Federal funds remained to cover the \$35,953,242 expenditure for Information and Referral (I&R), APS, Out-of-Home Care for Adults (OHC-A), Staff Development and Optional Services Programs.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The following is a report on the adequacy of CSBG funding as required by the Supplemental Report, 1987 Budget Act. In order to comply with the requirements of the Budget Act, the Department of Social Services (DSS) is to identify the funding and staffing levels that are necessary to fulfill the current requirements of the programs in CSBG. In addition, the Department is to determine the amount of resources that will be available from the CSBG to fund any additional requirements that may result from the current APS pilot projects.

The information in this report is formatted into five sections with each section corresponding to a specific requirement of the Supplemental Report. Some of the information for this report was derived from a questionnaire mailed to all Counties. The remainder of the information was taken from the County Welfare Departments' (CWDs) Administrative Expense Claims, quarterly statistics submitted by the CWDs, and information that was available from the Department's own computerized data base, the Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS).

When the Federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 was enacted on August 13, 1981, a reduction in Federal Title XX funding to the States resulted and placed Title XX social services funding under a "block grant concept." The separation of CWS from the CSBG funding occurred in FY 84/85. The Department established program priorities which maintained certain mandated programs according to existing regulations and repealed regulations in APS, I&R and OHC-A. The repeal of these program sections of the regulations permitted Counties to severely limit the scope of their adult services programs.

3

METHODOLOGY

Although block grant funding was implemented on August 13, 1981, as a result of the Federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, block grant funding did not go into effect until October 1, 1981. Due to the lack of available FY 81/82 data in both the County Welfare Departments (CWDs) and DSS, the earliest data included in this report is FY 82/83. The most recent data available for comparison at the time of this report is for FY 86/87.

The information in this report is formatted into five sections mandated by the Supplemental Report to the Budget Act of 1987.

- o The first section addresses the extent of County compliance with the regulations for the IHSS administration program in response to areas identified in the March 1987 report by the Auditor General. The Department's CMIPS data base was utilized to provide data on the Counties' reassessments of the need for continuing services to IHSS clients.
- o Two different methods for calculating the number of cases carried by IHSS social workers are described in the second section. Caseload data was obtained from the Management Statistics Summary which is produced by CMIPS. The number of social workers was obtained from the Social Services Management Information System (SSMIS). The SSMIS report is produced from the initial CWDs Administrative Expense Claims received. It does not include subsequent claim revisions.
- o A questionnaire was designed by a committee consisting of DSS Adult Services Bureau staff and staff from several CWDs. The purpose of the questionnaire was to provide the Department information on the extent of services being provided by the Counties which is included in the third section of this report. County staff completed and returned the questionnaires to DSS. Forty eight (83 percent) of the fifty eight Counties responded within the timeframe allotted for inclusion in this report. See the Attachment for a copy of the questionnaire. For the purpose of comparison, quarterly statistics submitted by the Counties together with total direct costs taken from the Counties Administrative Expense Claims are identified for both fiscal years.

- o The amount of total County overmatch is displayed for individual Counties as well as the statewide total in the fourth section. County overmatch is derived by combining the amount of County funds expended above the State allocation, if applicable, together with the amount of funds the Counties expended over the required SB 14 County Share.
- o The fifth section contains an estimate for prior year COLAs had they been granted, a table displaying the transfer of funds for FY 86/87, and a comparison of the number of staff, caseloads/referrals, and expenditures of the CSBG programs between FY 82/83 and 86/87.

PART I. COUNTY COMPLIANCE WITH THE IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES REGULATIONS

The March 1987 report by the Auditor General entitled, "The Department of Social Services Could Reduce Costs and Improve Compliance with Regulations of the IHSS Program" identified two areas in which it was felt that DSS did not always enforce compliance with regulations of the IHSS Program. The evaluation was based on 13,787 IHSS clients in San Joaquin, San Diego, and Santa Clara Counties. The two areas identified were as follows:

1. The Counties did not all verify that clients received services by comparing the client's signatures on their providers' timesheets to their actual signatures. It was estimated that 10.1 percent of the 13,787 clients did not sign the providers' timesheets. Regulations require that timesheets must be signed by both the client and the provider.

2. Counties did not always conduct timely reassessments of the need for continuing services to IHSS clients. From a visit to 3 counties, it was estimated that caseworkers were on an average of 49 days late in reassessing 16.7 percent of the 13,787 IHSS clients.

The Department's response to the Auditor General's report stated that an All County Letter (ACL) would be issued to Counties reminding them of their responsibility to ensure that payments are made only when signed timesheets are received. An ACL was issued in July 1987 reiterating the Counties' responsibility regarding the processing of IHSS provider timesheets. In addition, the ACL also required counties to submit a copy of their procedures on timesheet verification to the Department, and all Counties have met this requirement.

IHSS regulations require that reassessments of the need for continuing services to IHSS clients occur prior to the end of the twelfth calendar month from the last assessment. A review of the CMIPS data for June 1988 indicates that the Counties are providing reassessments within the mandatory timeframe and there is no indication currently that the statewide program is out of compliance with the regulations of the IHSS Program.

PART II. NUMBER OF CASES CARRIED BY IHSS SOCIAL WORKERS

There are different methods used by the State for calculating the number of cases carried by IHSS social workers. However, none of these methods reflect the actual workload of a social worker. Cases that are pending eligibility (intake cases) are not recognized and counted as a case until some action has been taken. Often Counties assign only 30-50 intake cases a month and claim an average social worker workload of 240 or more approved cases. (A caseload of 240 cases would require about 2.5 reassessments per work day per worker in addition to all other duties). Denied cases are not counted due to the fact that these clients were not eligible and the cases were never opened. Only "eligible," "interim eligible," and "leave" cases are counted in the total number of IHSS cases during any month.

METHOD 1

This method utilizes data from CMIPS to arrive at the average number of cases per month and the SSMIS report for the number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) for case carrying staff only.

SOURCE: CMIPS

SOURCE: SSMIS FY 86/87
STATEWIDE ACCUMULATIVE
*FTEs are not audited

1,442,659 TOTAL
IHSS cases FY 86/87
divided by 12 months
=120,222 cases
divided by FTEs = 155.4 cases per case carrying staff

773.75 FTEs*

Although, this method reflects the most accurate picture of the number of cases carried by case carrying staff based on State level data, it is not a true picture of the actual number of cases a social worker may actually be handling for the reasons described above.

METHOD 2

This method is identical to Method 1 but supervisors are included with case carrying staff in the calculation of FTEs. This method does not provide as accurate a picture because some supervisors do not carry cases.

120,222 cases divided by 871.5 FTEs* (including supervisors) = 137.9 cases per case carrying staff/supervisor

For the purpose of budgeting the programs of CSBG, the Estimates Branch of DSS uses both case carrying staff and supervisors in their calculation. The methodology used to develop the budget is based on actual data available when the November 1983 subvention estimate was prepared. Since social workers and social services supervisors were not shown separately on the SSMIS reports, the hours per FTE and the activity level per social worker includes supervisors as well as case carrying social workers. Total hours for Other County Social Services were divided by the FTEs to determine the annual number of hours per FTE (1656). The IHSS activity level of 127 cases per FTE, which has been used since the FY 84/85 budget, is based on actual cases and FTEs in March 1983, June 1983, and September 1983. FTE's are then divided by the total number of IHSS cases as reported on CMIPS.

If the total hours (=1,496,361.7) in 86/87 is divided by 1656 annual hours to determine the number of FTEs, the estimated number of FTEs (=903.6) would be slightly higher than the 871.5 FTEs which were reported. Based on the estimated FTEs and actual paid cases, the activity level would be 133 cases.

COMPARISON WITH FY 82/83

The following table shows the number of cases carried by IHSS case carrying staff/supervisors in FY 82/83. Due to the fact that timestudy claims did not separate the hours of supervisors and case carrying staff during 82/83, the data can only be compared to Method 2.

SOURCE: SOC 296 FY 82/83

SOURCE: SSMIS FY 82/83
STATEWIDE ACCUMULATIVE
*FTEs are not audited

94,635 cases

827.5 FTEs* (including
supervisors)

= 114.3 cases per case carrying
staff/supervisor

OVERALL COMPARISON FOR 82/83 AND 86/87

- o 27% increase in the number of cases
- o 20.6% increase of cases per case carrying staff/supervisor
- o 5.3% increase in the amount of staff

PART III. STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE COUNTIES

The repeal of the program content and Title XX funding reductions along with the implementation of block grant funding in 1981 granted the Counties the latitude to limit services in a manner which would only address the most pressing needs of local clients. The diversity in service delivery and program content among the Counties which resulted from this latitude necessitated the development of a questionnaire which would provide both current and historical information on County programs. The survey instrument was developed by a team of DSS staff and staff from several CWDs. Survey data on the programs funded by CSBG and the services provided by these programs are discussed below.

A. INFORMATION AND REFERRAL PROGRAM

The I&R Program provides short-term help and current information for all persons (children and adults) regarding available public and private resources to enable persons to identify and gain access to those resources which are appropriate to meet their needs. These activities are provided by social services staff and/or contracted agencies.

The quarterly statistical reports submitted by the Counties show that the total number of I&R referrals received in FY 82/83 was 749,036 as compared to 808,133 referrals (7.9 percent increase) received in FY 86/87. The total expenditures for the program increased from \$7,726,448 to \$11,244,030 (45 percent increase).

The Counties report that due to limited funds, an increase in the volume of clients and pressing needs in other programs, the quality of services provided under this program has been greatly diminished. For example, resource lists are handed out to clients and clients must contact resources without the benefit of a personal referral. Clients needing emergency community resources information no longer typically receive a screening interview. Clients are basically left on their own to obtain the services they need.

B. ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES PROGRAM

The APS Program consists of the actions taken by County social services staff to prevent or remedy danger to individuals 18 years or older who are unable to protect their own interests, harmed or threatened with harm, or caused physical or mental injury as a result of action or inaction by another person or their own actions. The services provided and the method for providing the services varies between Counties.

Currently, DSS has established APS demonstration projects in ten Counties which have been operational since 1986. Chapter 1163, Statutes of 1985 (SB 129) established a minimum of five APS model projects. Included in the services to be provided by the projects were 24-hour response, abuse report investigation, and crisis intervention. Chapter 1159, Statutes of 1985 (AB 57) established a minimum of six pilot projects which would provide emergency shelter for the elderly and dependent adult victims of abuse. Together, these projects are providing information to be used to develop proposed statewide standards for the APS Program.

The number of APS referrals received during 82/83 was 49,890. By comparison, the number of referrals received in 86/87 increased by 65 percent and totaled 82,474. The total expenditures for the APS program have increased from \$11,517,037 in 82/83 to \$22,728,379 (97 percent) in 86/87.

The data collected from the questionnaire show that the number of Counties providing an APS Emergency Response (ER) Program has increased from 32 percent to 62.5 percent since 82/83. Of those Counties having an APS emergency response program in 82/83, 20 percent of the Counties who completed the question responded to the majority of ER cases "within 2 hours" and 40 percent had a response time of "within 24 hours." In 86/87, the figures for response time have increased to 24 percent for "within 2 hours" and 52 percent for "within 24 hours". Combining the response times shows that the majority of ER cases are responded to within 24 hours in 76 percent of the Counties as compared to 60 percent in 82/83. A contributing factor to the improved response time could be the fact that pilot Counties had better response capabilities because they were required to provide 24 hour access to APS which includes the ability to respond immediately to emergency situations. The timeframes to respond depend on the priority status and definition given an ER case. Life threatening situations receive top priority, sometimes at the expense of other critical cases.

In addition, the data from the questionnaire show that of the Counties that responded (47 for this question), only 13 percent in 82/83 had a 24-hour I&R system for adult protective services as compared to 46 percent in 86/87. While the number of Counties has increased, the service level has decreased.

Although every County in the State is mandated to operate an APS Program, the services provided vary in the individual Counties. Even prior to the Title XX block grant funding and the repeal of program standards and content, Counties varied considerably in the content and organization of the APS Program. Some Counties had a separate APS unit while others had a mixed caseload of APS,

IHSS and OHC-A. With the enactment of recent legislation regarding elder and dependent adult abuse reporting law, all County APS units are, additionally responsible for accepting and investigating reports of abuse of elders and dependent adults. During 82/83, there were few staff, little training and limited resources. Counties had few mandated responsibilities and only general regulations for the APS program. Today, with the added responsibility for receiving abuse reports for elders and dependent adults, the Counties face increasing demands for service with no funding to increase staff.

The questionnaire shows that while the range of APS service activities provided by the Counties has increased, the level of service received by clients has decreased. Preventive and supportive services have been dropped as the demands of crisis intervention have increased. Today, only those individuals facing a crisis situation are likely to be served. It is also quite possible that the number of APS abuse referrals and crisis situations may have increased as a result of the elimination of preventive and long-term services. The data from the questionnaire shows that 31, out of 45 Counties which answered, have had an increase in the number of service activities they provide. It is unclear whether these services are typically provided directly by the CWDs or by referral to other agencies. It is important to note that 9 of the reporting Counties were APS SB 129 or AB 57 project Counties which received additional funding and were providing a wide range of service activities as a requirement of the projects.

C. OPTIONAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Social services programs in California are divided into two groups, mandated and optional. Eight mandated programs are required to be provided in every County in the State. The mandated programs are:

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Information and Referral | Family Reunification |
| Protective Services for Adults | Family Maintenance |
| Out-of-Home Care for Adults | Emergency Response |
| In-Home Supportive Services | Permanent Placement |

Of the 13 optional service programs, Counties may elect to provide any, all or none. The provision of which optional program(s) is a local choice and is based on local needs, priorities and resources.

The number of individuals receiving optional services has decreased from 12,698 in 82/83 to 7,533 (40.6 percent decrease)

in 86/87. For the same period, the total expenditures to provide optional service programs has decreased from \$2,050,904 to \$1,980,460 (3.4 percent decrease).

The data obtained from the questionnaire show a decrease in the number of optional programs currently being provided. Only 11 Counties even provide optional programs with the most common programs being Services to Alleviate or Prevent Family Problems and Services for Disabled Individuals. Three Counties provide the Employment/Education/Training Program and the Housing Referral Services Program and two provide Sustenance and Home Management and Other Functional Educational Services. Optional services programs no longer being provided are Special Services to the Blind and Services to County Jail Inmates. With the increase in the demand for services in the mandated programs, the ability of Counties to provide optional programs has been substantially reduced.

D. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The Staff Development Program makes available to staff, training and staff development activities in the areas of skills, techniques and knowledge necessary to or advantageous in achieving job objectives. The training may be provided by County training officers, first line supervisors, contracted trainers, professional or educational institutions.

The data from the questionnaire, supported by the figures on the administrative claims, show that out of the total expenditures for staff development 28 percent (\$694,227) is spent for Adult Programs as compared to 72 percent (\$1,797,202) for Children's Services. However, staff development expenditures for both adult services and CWS are funded out of the CSBG.

Staff Development expenditures for the CSBG funded programs have increased from \$332,972 in 82/83 to \$694,227 in 86/87 (an increase of 108 percent). The increase in staff development expenditures corresponds to the staff increases in the adult programs. The increase in APS staff is the result of a 65 percent increase in the number of APS referrals.

PART IV. AMOUNT OF COUNTY OVERMATCH FOR FY 86/87

County overmatch is not an indication of the full degree of need. It only represents the amount of County resources Counties have been able to commit to meet program needs.

AMOUNT OF TOTAL COUNTY OVERMATCH FOR FY 86/87

| STATE F.Y. 86/87 Allocation | SB 14 Required Share | Total State/SB14 Amount | Total CSBG Expenditures | Total County Overmatch | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Alameda | 2,176,832 | 720,918 | 2,897,750 | 3,837,168 | 939,418 |
| Alpine | 10,986 | 3,176 | 14,162 | 14,493 | 331 |
| Amador | 44,531 | 6,118 | 50,649 | 63,107 | 12,458 |
| Butte | 613,827 | 80,807 | 694,634 | 678,183 | -16,451 |
| Calaveras | 50,982 | 10,791 | 61,773 | 76,177 | 14,404 |
| Colusa | 36,408 | 7,841 | 44,249 | 54,685 | 10,436 |
| Contra Costa | 1,769,899 | 607,044 | 2,376,943 | 4,221,685 | 1,844,742 |
| Del Norte | 46,432 | 12,643 | 59,075 | 53,845 | -5,230 |
| El Dorado | 151,584 | 39,776 | 191,360 | 214,568 | 23,208 |
| Fresno | 1,988,910 | 309,864 | 2,298,774 | 2,485,636 | 186,862 |
| Glenn | 61,054 | 10,746 | 71,800 | 80,527 | 8,727 |
| Humboldt | 257,500 | 68,350 | 325,850 | 340,908 | 15,058 |
| Imperial | 192,846 | 55,708 | 248,554 | 286,171 | 37,617 |
| Inyo | 71,933 | 19,262 | 91,195 | 79,524 | -11,671 |
| Kern | 461,832 | 233,343 | 695,175 | 932,910 | 237,735 |
| Kings | 140,530 | 42,381 | 182,911 | 169,454 | -13,457 |
| Lake | 148,536 | 20,876 | 169,412 | 184,003 | 14,591 |
| Lassen | 47,184 | 9,889 | 57,073 | 40,156 | -16,917 |
| Los Angeles | 23,619,782 | 4,928,860 | 28,548,642 | 34,989,970 | 6,441,328 |
| Madera | 182,172 | 44,559 | 226,731 | 208,933 | -17,798 |
| Marin | 288,033 | 98,790 | 386,823 | 770,734 | 383,911 |
| Mariposa | 39,041 | 4,751 | 43,792 | 60,410 | 16,618 |
| Mendocino | 309,551 | 76,821 | 386,372 | 392,499 | 6,127 |
| Merced | 403,782 | 89,547 | 493,329 | 526,517 | 33,188 |
| Modoc | 20,565 | 5,237 | 25,802 | 38,975 | 13,173 |
| Mono | 15,130 | 3,915 | 19,045 | 19,625 | 580 |
| Monterey | 574,561 | 136,854 | 711,415 | 1,112,630 | 401,215 |
| Napa | 189,007 | 46,265 | 235,272 | 290,251 | 54,979 |
| Nevada | 138,041 | 20,625 | 158,666 | 213,548 | 54,882 |

| | STATE F.Y. 86/87 Allocation | SB 14 Required Share | Total State/SB14 Amount | Total CSBG Expenditures | Total County Overmatch |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Orange | 2,597,589 | 563,445 | 3,161,034 | 3,794,421 | 633,387 |
| Placer | 356,536 | 55,421 | 411,957 | 416,317 | 4,360 |
| Plumas | 41,734 | 9,009 | 50,743 | 62,848 | 12,105 |
| Riverside | 1,798,272 | 359,679 | 2,157,951 | 2,125,341 | -32,610 |
| Sacramento | 3,434,818 | 1,107,749 | 4,542,567 | 4,986,736 | 444,169 |
| San Benito | 45,963 | 9,041 | 55,004 | 63,902 | 8,898 |
| San Bernardino | 1,974,690 | 464,270 | 2,438,960 | 2,716,204 | 277,244 |
| San Diego | 4,075,824 | 959,319 | 5,035,143 | 5,578,466 | 543,323 |
| San Francisco | 2,383,403 | 558,744 | 2,942,147 | 5,910,451 | 2,968,304 |
| San Joaquin | 1,075,245 | 268,267 | 1,343,512 | 1,072,698 | -270,814 |
| San Luis Obispo | 180,649 | 58,568 | 239,217 | 386,126 | 146,909 |
| San Mateo | 1,523,349 | 334,103 | 1,857,452 | 2,226,085 | 368,633 |
| Santa Barbara | 412,163 | 130,036 | 542,199 | 749,812 | 207,613 |
| Santa Clara | 2,378,334 | 815,726 | 3,194,060 | 4,703,358 | 1,509,298 |
| Santa Cruz | 383,576 | 98,107 | 481,683 | 925,523 | 443,840 |
| Shasta | 267,566 | 80,037 | 347,603 | 371,952 | 24,349 |
| Sierra | 17,487 | 3,672 | 21,159 | 27,939 | 6,780 |
| Siskiyou | 71,091 | 16,682 | 87,773 | 98,434 | 10,661 |
| Solano | 482,879 | 122,171 | 605,050 | 714,209 | 109,159 |
| Sonoma | 525,128 | 161,202 | 686,330 | 1,080,625 | 394,295 |
| Stanislaus | 830,750 | 187,294 | 1,018,044 | 1,017,844 | -200 |
| Sutter | 112,926 | 30,575 | 143,501 | 129,343 | -14,158 |
| Tehama | 115,588 | 20,381 | 135,969 | 120,580 | -15,389 |
| Trinity | 23,953 | 6,370 | 30,323 | 33,138 | 2,815 |
| Tulare | 1,127,611 | 177,857 | 1,305,468 | 1,094,210 | -211,258 |
| Tuolumne | 86,695 | 20,018 | 106,713 | 129,993 | 23,280 |
| Ventura | 696,508 | 189,124 | 885,632 | 1,051,595 | 165,963 |
| Yolo | 257,450 | 73,267 | 330,717 | 341,080 | 10,363 |
| Yuba | 207,804 | 41,745 | 249,549 | 266,524 | 16,975 |
| TOTAL | 61,537,052 | 14,637,636 | 76,174,688 | 94,633,046 | 18,458,358 * |

* This total accurately reflects the statewide County overmatch; however, overmatch amounts for individual Counties will change due to the redistribution of surplus funds process which will not occur until fiscal year 1986/87 closeout (May 1989). In addition, figures could change due to the submittal of supplemental claims prior to the closeout process.

PART V. THE EXTENT TO WHICH PURCHASING POWER LOSSES HAVE AFFECTED SERVICE DELIVERY

Beginning in 81/82, the Budget Act limited the State's participation in COLA increases to the CSBG as follows:

| YEAR | COLA | YEAR | COLA |
|---------|------|---------|------|
| 1981/82 | 6% | 1984/85 | 3% |
| 1982/83 | 0 | 1985/86 | 4% |
| 1983/84 | 0 | 1986/87 | 0 |

Since 81/82, if a County granted COLA increases in excess of the State limits, the County was responsible for the costs. This type of control reduced State level costs but did not increase productivity. The compounding effects of limits have significantly reduced the Counties' ability to carry out program objectives. In recognition of this fact, five Counties, which met certain criteria, were permitted to transfer CWS funds to cover adult services costs in 86/87. Kern County, on the other hand, was the only County to transfer funds from CSBG to CWS. The following table displays the transfer of funds for FY 86/87:

| COUNTY | TRANSFERRED FROM | TOTAL AMOUNT (includes County share) |
|------------|------------------|---|
| Inyo | CWS | \$40,000 |
| Mendocino | CWS | \$100,000 |
| Sacramento | CWS | \$1,990,667 |
| Tuolumne | CWS | \$16,000 |
| Yolo | CWS | \$79,547 |
| | | ----- |
| | | \$2,226,214 |
| Kern | CSBG | \$379,500 |

County Welfare Departments have usually exceeded the State's CSBG COLA limitations. In some instances, local bargaining units negotiate COLAs for their rank-and-file members countywide rather than just for one functional entity. CWDs are obligated to participate in these countywide agreements. Also some Counties had multi-year contracts already in place which provided for COLAs in excess of the limitations.

The lack of COLA adjustments over the last several years has had an adverse impact on the purchasing power of the Counties. The following table represents the amount of funds necessary to fund prior year COLAs had they been granted:

TOTAL ADDITIONAL COSTS FOR COLAS

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| | \$18,142,000 | IHSS Admin. |
| \$26,951,000 | 4,231,300 | Other Services |
| | ----- | |
| | \$22,374,000 | General Fund |
| | \$4,577,000 | County Share |

The method for computing prior year COLAs is as follows:

Actual County expenditures and hours were used to derive the cost per FTE for 86/87. The 86/87 cost per FTE was then increased by the 87/88 COLA of 3.73 percent to derive a current cost per FTE of \$69,800 for IHSS administration and \$63,600 for Other Services. The current costs were compared to the cost per FTE allowable in the 88/89 appropriation to calculate the percent increase. The percent increase of 41.4 percent for IHSS administration and 19.3 percent for Other Services was then applied to the total amount appropriated in 88/89 and to the State and County share to derive the amounts for the prior year COLA. Total additional costs would be \$26,951,000.

The amount of staff for the programs funded under CSBG has increased, with the exception of Optional Programs, as shown in the table below:

SOURCE: SSMIS Accumulative Report
FY 82/83 and 86/87
*FTE's are not audited

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF STAFF

| | 1982/83 | 1986/87 | Percentage Change |
|-----------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| I&R | 159.4 | 162.5 | 2% |
| APS/OHC-A | 215.3 | 330.3 | 53.4% |
| IHSS | 827.5 | 871.5 | 5.3% |
| OPTIONAL | 19.0 | 15.2 | -20% |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| | 1221.2* | 1379.5* | 13.% Total |

The amount of staff has had to increase to keep up with the continuing climb of referrals in the adult programs. Even with the increased numbers, Counties are feeling the frustration of trying to respond to the needs of local clients with too few staff. As the level of staff increased to meet the increasing caseloads and demand for services, the costs of these also increased.

SOURCE: SSMIS
FY 82/83 and 86/87

COMPARISON OF COSTS

| | FY 82/83 | FY 86/87 | Percentage Change** |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Total | Total | |
| I&R | \$7,726,428 | \$11,244,030 | 45% |
| APS/OHC-A | \$11,517,037 | \$22,728,379 | 97% |
| OPTIONAL | \$2,050,904 | \$1,980,460 | -3.4% |
| IHSS | \$43,860,483 | \$60,825,110 | 38.6% |
| | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| TOTAL | \$65,154,852 | \$96,777,979* | 48.5% |

* SSMIS data does not include data from revised claims that are received at a later date. Therefore, the total CSBG expenditure is different from the figure displayed on page 12.

** The percentage change increases in program expenditures have increased more than the percentage change in the number of caseload/referrals due to the Counties granting COLAs during this period.

SOURCE: SOC 242
FY 82/83 and 86/87

COMPARISON OF CASELOAD/REFERRAL

| | FY 82/83 | FY 86/87 | Percentage Change |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------------------|
| I&R | 749,036 | 808,133 | 7.9% |
| APS/OHC-A | 49,890 | 82,474 | 65% |
| OPTIONAL | 12,698 | 7,533 | -40.6% |
| IHSS | 94,635 | 120,222 | 27.0% |

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Major factors in the increase of program expenditures were the increase in the number of clients served and the Counties granting of COLAs to CWD staff.

APS program caseload and expenditures have increased at a greater rate than other CSBG funded programs. The costs for APS cases are disproportionately higher than for the other CSBG programs because these cases require more staff time.

While APS cases/referrals have increased by 65 percent, staffing has increased only 53.4 percent, which has resulted in a diminished level of service resources per case.

Almost \$27 million would be required in FY 88/89 to bring CSBG funding for COLAs up to date and additional funding would be required to add staff to properly handle caseload increases which have occurred in I&R, APS and OHC-A.

Any mandatory APS standards that are established by the State will require increased funding. Because of block grant funding, the extent to which state funds are spent on each individual CSBG funded program as opposed to expenditures of County funds on each program is not readily available. Although it is not likely, it would be possible for Counties to use funds to first meet the specifically mandated costs of IHSS activities. If Counties did this, only \$711,942 in State/Federal funds remained to cover the \$35,953,242 expenditure for I&R, APS, OHC-A, Staff Development and Optional Services Programs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



June 10, 1988

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS
IHSS PROGRAM MANAGERS

SUBJECT: ADULT SERVICES ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to be completed by all Counties pursuant to an agreement between the Department of Social Services and the County Welfare Directors Association. The data will be used to report to the Legislature on the adequacy of County Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding, as required by the 1987/88 Budget Act. The questionnaire should be completed as fully as is possible from information that is readily available (without extensive case by case research). Where documentation is not available, and this may be the case for the questions asking for fiscal year (FY) 82/83 data, you may rely on the recollections of program staff to best answer the questions.

This questionnaire must be returned to SDSS not later than June 24, 1988. Please return the questionnaire to:

Department of Social Services
Adult Services Bureau
744 P Street, MS 6-536
Sacramento, CA 95814

ATTN: Karen Mathies

Thank you for your assistance in meeting this requirement.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Robert A. Barton'.

Robert A. Barton, Chief
Adult Services Bureau

Attachment

SDSS ADULT SERVICES ACTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

COMPLETED BY

COUNTY

TITLE

PHONE

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire is to be completed by all Counties pursuant to an agreement between the Department of Social Services and the County Welfare Directors Association. The data will be used to report to the Legislature on the adequacy of CSBG funding, as required by the 1987/88 Budget Act. Please complete the questionnaire and return it by June 24, 1988 to:

Department of Social Services
Adult Services Bureau
744 P Street, MS 6-536
Sacramento, CA 95814

ATTN: Karen Mathies

PART A. INFORMATION AND REFERRAL (I & R)

1. How are information and referral services provided?

Check (✓) one for each time period.

82/83

86/87

- ☐ by designated staff
☐ all staff
☐ contract
☐ other

- ☐ by designated staff
☐ all staff
☐ contract
☐ other

2. During 82/83 or 86/87, did you have a 24 hour information and referral system for adult protective services?

82/83

86/87

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

PART B. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. How many adult services social workers received training in:

82/83

86/87

2. Identify the total number of current adult social services staff who are not yet trained.

Staff

3. What percentage of Staff Development costs are being spent on Adult Programs versus CWS/Adoptions/Licensing?

82/83

86/87

% Adults

% Adults

% CWS/Adoptions/
Licensing
% CWS/Adoptions/
Licensing

4. Indicate how the training of Adult Services staff was provided:

82/83

86/87

- ☐
☐
☐

- ☐ by first line supervisor only
☐ by County training officer
☐ by contract trainer/professional or educational institution

Approximate number of training
hours per month per worker

PART C. ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES (APS) AND OUT-OF-HOME CARE FOR ADULTS (OHC-A)

1. Check (✓) which services/activities below were components of APS and OHC-A and were provided during 82/83 and 86/87:

82/83

86/87

- ☐ counseling
☐ advocacy
☐ respite care
☐ medical care
☐ conservatorship
☐ case management
☐ money management/
rep. payee
☐ physical rehabilitation
☐ vocational rehabilitation
☐ legal services
☐ 24 hour access
- ☐ coordination
☐ investigation of abuse
☐ assessment
☐ community outreach/
prevention
☐ in-home transitional
☐ emergency shelter
☐ in-home care
☐ out-of-home care/placement
☐ transportation
☐ food
☐ clothing

- ☐ counseling
☐ advocacy
☐ respite care
☐ medical care
☐ conservatorship
☐ case management
☐ money management/
rep. payee
☐ physical rehabilitation
☐ vocational rehabilitation
☐ legal services
☐ 24 hour access
- ☐ coordination
☐ investigation of abuse
☐ assessment
☐ community outreach/
prevention
☐ in-home transitional
☐ emergency shelter
☐ in-home care
☐ out-of-home care/placement
☐ transportation
☐ food
☐ clothing

2. Did you have an APS emergency response (ER) program?

During 82/83: ☐ Yes ☐ No

During 86/87: ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If you had an APS ER program, check (✓) the time frame which best indicates the response time of the majority of emergency response cases.

82/83

- ☐ within 2 hours
☐ within 24 hours
☐ within 3 days
☐ within 5 days
☐ within 10 days

86/87

- ☐ within 2 hours
☐ within 24 hours
☐ within 3 days
☐ within 5 days
☐ within 10 days

PART D. OPTIONAL SERVICES

1. Check (✓) which optional services programs were provided during 82/83 and 86/87:

82/83 86/87

82/83 86/87

- ☐ ☐ Special Care for Children in Their Own Homes
☐ ☐ Home Management and Other Functional Educational Services
☐ ☐ Employment/Education/Training
☐ ☐ Services for Children with Special Problems
☐ ☐ Services to Alleviate or Prevent Family Problems
☐ ☐ Sustenance
☐ ☐ Housing Referral Services

- ☐ ☐ Legal Referral Service
☐ ☐ Diagnostic Treatment Services for Children
☐ ☐ Special Services for the Blind
☐ ☐ Special Services for Adults
☐ ☐ Services for Disabled Individuals
☐ ☐ Services to County Jail Inmates

PART E. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Does your County have any social workers who do both IHSS/APS? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If Yes, identify how many workers

b. If Yes, identify how many total cases

APS

IHSS

2. Since FY 86/87, have you had any major changes in staffing? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If Yes, indicate when, how many, whether the changes were increases (+) or decreases (-) and the type of position.

| Date of Change | # of Positions | + or - | Type of Position |
|----------------|----------------|--------|------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |

3. Since FY 86/87, have you had any major changes in services provided? ☐ Yes ☐ No

a. If Yes, indicate when the changes occurred, the service and the outcome.

| Date of Change | Services Added or Deleted | Impact on Clients |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| | | |
| | | |

4. As a result of abuse reporting laws and requirements, what changes, if any, have occurred in your APS Program?

Number increase in APS referrals Per Month

Number decrease in APS referrals Per Month

Are APS referrals more appropriate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Are more community resources now available? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5. What is the number of clerical staff in Adult Programs?

82/83

Clerical Staff

86/87

Clerical Staff

6. What is the ratio of clerical staff to program staff in Adult Programs?

82/83

Clerical Staff

86/87

Clerical Staff

SW

SW

7. Have you transferred funds from CWS to CSBG? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes,

Year

Amount

Year

Amount